UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/072,396 | 02/05/2002 | Richard St.Clair Bailey | MS190455.01 | 4779 |

69316 7590 10/02/2008

MICROSOFT CORPORATION
ONE MICROSOFT WAY
REDMOND, WA 98052

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| ROSWELL, MICHAEL | |
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| 2173 | |
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| 10/02/2008 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 10/072,396 | BAILEY ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Michael Roswell | 2173 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 August 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *42-57* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *42-57* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *20080811*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

**DETAILED ACTION**

This Office action is in response to the Request for Continued Examination filed 11 August 2008.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 42-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lum et al (US Patent 6,065,041), hereinafter Lum, Rosenzweig et al (US Patent 7,020,848), hereinafter Rosenzweig, and Apte et al (US Patent 6,289,395).

Regarding claim 42, 45 and 51, Lum teaches an application (the Console Application Programming Interface [CAPI] of col. 3, lines 12-27 and 48-56), a data source locally accessible to the application that includes a plurality of data elements (the storing of interfaces in a system database at col. 3, lines 28-36, with further accessing by the CAPI at col. 8, lines 29-39), software to select a configuration and an appearance of a list of data items from the data source to be presented, and a list manager to be instantiated by the software (see col. 4, lines 26-42; with support for list displays at col. 13, lines 10-14) to: act as an interface between the data source and the list, receive the configuration and the appearance from the software, access the data source, and populate the list of data items according to the configuration and the appearance (taught as the client/server style interface updating of col. 10, lines 48-53).

However, Lum fails to explicitly teach wrapping one or more display controls that are attached to the list with a property that stores a unique identifier that specifies which said data

element a particular said display control is currently displaying, the unique identifier identifying an additional property of the data element from the data source.

Rosenzweig teaches a graphical user interface for displaying a list and array of elements taken from a data source, similar to that of Lum. Furthermore, Rosenzweig teaches wrapping one or more display controls that are attached to the list with a property that stores a unique identifier that specifies which said data element a particular said display control is currently displaying, the unique identifier identifying an additional property of the data element from the data source, taught as the display of metadata (area 118 for "specific information") related to a selected data element, as can be seen in Fig. 2 and disclosed at col. 3, lines 16-23.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Lum and Rosenzweig before him at the time the invention was made to modify the display list of Lum to include the metadata display of Rosenzweig. One would have been motivated to make such a combination for the advantage of affording the user a more robust navigation method for a selected database. See Rosenzweig, col. 1, lines 60-67.

However, Lum and Rosenzweig fail to explicitly teach the above "wrapping" limitation being done without listening to a data item corresponding to the data element. Apte teaches an event processor for use in a an application similar to that of Lum and Rosenzweig. Apte further teaches a "generic event listener" that allows for the monitoring of arbitrary events in an arbitrary manner, without having to listen to a particular data item, at col. 2, lines 25-46.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Lum, Rosenzweig and Apte before him at the time the invention was made to modify the application of Lum and Rosenzweig to include the generic event listener of Apte. One would have been motivated to make such a combination for the advantage of passing

events between a source and sink "without them knowing about each other". See Apte, col. 2, lines 12-16.

Claims 45 and 51 recite limitations similar to claim 42, and as such are similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 43, Lum teaches a system wherein the list manager further populates the list of data items according to a scrolling event, taught as the client/server style interface updating of col. 10, lines 48-53.

Regarding claim 44, Lum teaches a system wherein the list manager is capable of residing on various systems using various computing platforms and being added to various applications, taught as the cross platform/application functionality of col. 7, lines 55-63.

Regarding claim 46, Lum and Rosenzweig teach a method for managing a display state of the display controls (as seen in Rosenzweig), and the display state changes between a request to change data elements in the display controls and an actual change of the data elements in the display controls, taught as the event driven client/server style interface updating at col. 10, lines 48-53 of Lum.

Regarding claim 47, Lum and Rosenzweig teach a method for managing a display state of the display controls, and the display state of the display controls changes while data elements in the display controls are changing, taught as the event driven client/server style interface updating at col. 10, lines 48-53 of Lum.

Regarding claim 48, Rosenzweig teaches managing a display state of the display controls, and the display state changes in response to a selection of a user of the list generating engine (taught as the selection of graphical elements and the display of related data, at col. 3, lines 16-38).

Regarding claim 49, Lum and Rosenzweig teach managing a display state of the display controls, and the display state of the display controls is managed simultaneously while managing the data elements in the display controls (taught as the use of the variable manager of Rosenzweig in combination with the event driven client/server style interface updating at col. 10, lines 48-53 of Lum).

Regarding claim 50, Lum teaches the application listening to forwarded events without listening to the events directly from the display list, taught through the event driven client/server interface updating of col. 10, lines 48-53 of Lum.

Regarding claim 52, Lum and Rosenzweig teach means for changing the display state of the display controls while continuing to manage the data elements in the display controls, (taught as the use of the variable manager of Rosenzweig in combination with the event driven client/server style interface updating at col. 10, lines 48-53 of Lum).

Regarding claim 53, Lum and Rosenzweig teach the display state of the display controls changes between a request to change data elements in the display controls and an actual change of the data elements in the display controls, (taught as the use of the variable manager of Rosenzweig in combination with the event driven client/server style interface updating at col.

10, lines 48-53 of Lum).

Regarding claim 54, Lum and Rosenzweig teach the display state of the display controls changes while data elements in the display controls are changing, (taught as the use of the variable manager of Rosenzweig in combination with the event driven client/server style interface updating at col. 10, lines 48-53 of Lum).

Regarding claim 55, Rosenzweig teaches the display state changes in response to a selection of a user of the list generating engine (taught as the selection of graphical elements, and the display of related data, at col. 3, lines 16-38).

Regarding claim 56, Lum and Rosenzweig teach means for managing the display state of the display controls, wherein the means for managing the display state of the display controls functions simultaneously with the means for managing the data elements in the display controls, (taught as the use of the variable manager of Rosenzweig in combination with the event driven client/server style interface updating at col. 10, lines 48-53 of Lum).

Regarding claim 57, Lum teaches the application listening to forwarded events without listening to the events directly from the display list, taught through the event driven client/server interface updating of col. 10, lines 48-53 of Lum.

### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 42-57 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Roswell whose telephone number is (571)272-4055. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 6:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dennis Chow can be reached on (571) 272-7767. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tadesse Hailu/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2173

Michael Roswell
9/26/2008